



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,904	11/24/2003	George Sgouros	D6348CIP	5297

7590 04/02/2007
Benjamin Aaron Adler
ADLER & ASSOCIATES
8011 Candle Lane
Houston, TX 77071

EXAMINER

PERREIRA, MELISSA JEAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1618

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
31 DAYS	04/02/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/720,904	Applicant(s) SGOUROS ET AL.	
	Examiner Melissa Perreira	Art Unit 1618	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-59 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-59 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-19 are drawn to a method of reducing the systemic release of radioactive decay intermediates, classified in class 424, subclass 9.52.
 - II. Claims 20-33 are drawn to a method of targeting cells in an individual for liposomal delivery of an alpha particle-emitting radionuclide, classified in class 424, subclass 9.52.
 - III. Claims 34-42 are drawn to a method of targeting cells expressing HER-2/neu protein in an individual for liposomal delivery of Ac-225, classified in class 424, subclass 9.52.
 - IV. Claims 43-59 are drawn to an encapsulated alpha particle emitting radionuclide, classified in class 424, subclass 1.21.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and II are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are directed to a method of reducing the systemic release of radioactive decay intermediates and the method of targeting cells in an individual for liposomal delivery of an alpha particle-emitting radionuclide. These methods are unrelated as they may be performed with different liposomal compositions and may include different method steps. The liposomal compositions of the methods may

Art Unit: 1618

include different types of targeting agents, such as antibodies, peptides, engineered molecules, etc. which would provide for materially different liposomal compositions. These materially different liposomal compositions will target different cells, thus providing different modes of operation and will yield a different effect. Since the methods may be accomplished with materially different liposomal compositions they are unrelated. A search of these unrelated inventions would require an undue search burden.

3. Inventions I/II and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions directed to a method of reducing the systemic release of radioactive decay intermediates, the method of targeting cells in an individual for liposomal delivery of an alpha particle-emitting radionuclide and the method of targeting cells expressing HER-2/neu protein in an individual for liposomal delivery of Ac-225. These methods are unrelated as they may be performed with different liposomal compositions and may include different method steps. The liposomal compositions of the methods of groups I and II comprises radionuclides, such as ^{212}Pb with different types of targeting agents, such as antibodies, peptides, engineered molecules, etc. The liposomal composition of the method of group III comprises ^{225}Ac and may include different types of molecules, etc. which would provide for materially different liposomal compositions than those of groups I and II. These materially different liposomal compositions will generate different daughter radionuclides and target different cells, thus providing different modes of

Art Unit: 1618

operation and will yield a different effect. Since the methods may be accomplished with materially different liposomal compositions they are unrelated. Also, the method of group II involves targeting cells with a liposomal composition while the method of group III is the method of targeting cells expressing HER 2/neu protein which don't necessarily required the same liposomal composition and would be capable of being performed in a distinct manner. A search of these unrelated inventions would require an undue search burden.

4. Inventions IV and I/II/III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case an encapsulated alpha particle emitting radionuclide and the methods of reducing the systemic release of radioactive decay intermediates, targeting cells in an individual for liposomal delivery of an alpha particle-emitting radionuclide and targeting cells expressing HER-2/neu protein in an individual for liposomal delivery of Ac-225. As described above the methods of groups I,II and III can be performed with materially different liposomal compositions and not necessarily with the encapsulated alpha particle emitting radionuclide of group IV. Therefore the inventions are not useable together. A search of these unrelated inventions would require an undue search burden.

Art Unit: 1618

5. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an **election of an invention** to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i). Due to the complex nature of the instant restriction requirement, a written restriction requirement was necessitated. See MPEP § 812.01.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the

Art Unit: 1618

requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melissa Perreira whose telephone number is 571-272-1354. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am-5pm M-F.

Art Unit: 1618

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Hartley can be reached on 571-272-0616. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MP
March 28, 2007



MICHAEL G. HARTLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER